A Fairytale of Abdullah Ibn Saba; refuted.

Author's Note:
To the reader, when people write critical and objective articles without identifying themselves, such as the article bellow, it feels like I'm reading and refuting a pamphlet written by the KKK. It's spooky, and detracts greatly from the weight of any comments made. This absurd and anonymous article ABDULLAH IBN SABA; FOUNDER OF SHIISM is another ploy demonstrated by the anti-Shi'ah syndicate in order to mislead, cast confusion and discord among the Shi'ah in particular and Muslims in general. The anti-Shi'ah zealots have attempted to invert every truth about the forthright successor ship of Ali ibn abi Talib (a.s.) to accommodate their predecessor's fundamental error, i.e. the irrational and fraudulent concept of caliphate, hence, its stepchild the misconception of (shura).

A Fairytale Refuted by Facts

"Oh you believe, if a transgressor comes to you with news, try to verify it, lest you inflict damage on people unwittingly; then you may consequently regret your hasty action. (ch. 49, v.6)

The enemies of Islam whose singleness of purpose was/is to confuse, mislead, and split the Muslims, in their effort to explain the emergence of Shi'ah, claim that the Shi'ah are a sect originated by Abdullah Ibn Saba, a Jew, who embraced Islam during the reign of Uthman Ibn Affan, the third caliph. Furthermore, they claim that Abdullah Ibn Saba traveled in Muslim cities and towns, from Damascus to Kufa to Egypt; proselytizing to the Muslims that Ali is the Prophet's successor. They also claim that Abdullah Ibn Saba enticed the Muslims to kill Uthman since he believed Uthman had usurped the seat of Imam Ali. Furthermore, they claim that he also made mischief in the armies of Ali and his opponents in the battle of Camel. Some anti Shi'ah zealots, even today, conjecture that he was also responsible for the Shi'ah's " false ideology", as insinuated by this anonymous author. These mercenary writers believe that Abdullah Ibn Saba is the ORIGIN of Shi'ah; and since he himself was a hypocrite and a falsifier of tales, then all the knowledge and beliefs of the Shia are false as well. In fact, Abdullah Ibn Saba is the best scapegoat for all the claims of some Sunnis. This is the only tactic the anti- Shi'ah zealots can muster up; yet, this fictitious story has always failed to pass the giggle test among most common Muslims, let alone the scholars.

The fictitious stories attributed to the character of Abdullah Ibn Saba originated from the satanic mind of Sayf Ibn Umar al-Tamimi. He was a storyteller, lived in the second century after Hijrah, and died after the year 170 AH (750 AD), al-Dhahabi said that Sayf died during the rule of Haroon al-Rashid in Baghdad (Iraq). Sayf shaped his stories by some primary facts he found in the documented history of Islam available at that time. Sayf wrote a novel much the same as what Salman Rushdi did in "Satanic Verses" with similar motives, but with the difference that the role of Satan in this case was given to poor Abdullah Ibn Saba. Moreover, he distorted the biographies of the companions of the Holy Prophet (PBUH&HF) to please the government of his time, and to distort the history of Shi'ah and to ridicule Islam. Sayf was a staunch advocate of the Umayads, who were known throughout history to be one of the worst enemies of Ahlul-Bayt, and as such, it was in his best interest to invent such stories to degrade the Shiah. Here is the proof given by the Sunni Ulama:

The following leading Sunni scholars confirm that Sayf Ibn Umar was a well known liar and untrustworthy:

1. al-Hakim (d. 405 AH) wrote: "Sayf is accused of being a heretic. His narrations are abandoned."
2. al-Nisa'i (d. 303 AH) wrote: "Sayf's narrations are weak and they should be disregarded because he was unreliable and untrustworthy."
3. Yahya Ibn Mueen (d. 233 AH) wrote: "Sayf's narrations are weak and useless."
4. Abu Hatam (d. 277 AH) wrote: "Sayf's Hadith is rejected."
5. Ibn Abi Hatam (d. 327 AH) wrote: "Scholars have abandoned Sayf's narrations."
6. Abu Dawud (d. 316 AH) wrote: "Sayf is nothing. He was a liar. Some of his Hadiths were conveyed and the majority of them are denied."
7. Ibn Habban (d. 354 AH) wrote: "Sayf attributed fabricated traditions to the good reporters. He was accused of being a heretic and a liar."
8. Ibn Abd al-Barr (d. 462 AH) mentined in his writing abut al-Qa'qa: "Sayf reported that al-Qa'qa Said: I attended the death of the Prophet Muhammad." Ibn Adb al-Barr continued: "Ibn Abu Hatam said: Sayf is weak. Thus, what was conveyed of the presence of al-Qa'qa at the death of the Prophet is rejected. We mentioned the Sayf's traditions for knowledge only."
9. al-Darqutini (d. 385 AH) wrote: "Sayf is weak".
10. Firoozabadi (d. 817 AH) in "Towalif" mentioned Sayf and some others by saying: "They are weak."
11. Ibn al-Sakan (d. 353 AH) wrote: "Sayf is weak."
12. Safi al-Din (d. 923 AH) wrote: "Sayf is considered weak."
13. Ibn Udei (d. 365 AH) wrote about Sayf: "He is weak. Some of his narrations are famous yet the majority of his narrations are disgraceful and not followed."
14. al-Suyuti (d. 900 AH) wrote: "Sayf's Hadith is weak."
15. Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani (d. 852 AH) wrote after mentioning a tradition: "Many reporters of this tradition are weak, and the weakest among them is Sayf." It is interesting to see that although al-

> Dhahabi (d. 748 AH) has quoted from the book of Sayf in his History, he has mentioned in his other book that Sayf as a weak narrator. In "al-Mughni fi al-Dhu'afa'" al-Dhahabi wrote:
>
> "Sayf has two books which have been unanimously abandoned by the scholars." (al-Mughni fi al-Dhu'afa', by al-Dhahabi, p292)

The result of the investigation into Sayf's life shows that Sayf was an agnostic and an unreliable storyteller. Stories told by him are dubious at best and entirely or partly forged. In his stories, he has used names of cities that never existed in the world. Abdullah Ibn Saba is the star of those stories. He also introduced some 150 imaginary companions for the Prophet to fill out the empty characters of his scenarios, by giving them some strange names that are not found in any other documents. Furthermore, the timing of the events given by Sayf's narrations contradicts the authentic Sunni documents. Sayf has also used imaginary chains of narrators, and reported many miraculous events (like talking cows with human etc...)

Bellow, I have produced the anonymous and seething article in full. Although, the evidence, I have provided above, is so conclusive that based just on it the article bellow should be dismissed. Never the less, in fairness I will respond. (inshallah)

'ABDULLAH IBN SABA - FOUNDER OF SHI'ISM?

---

jamiat.org.za states:
There have been a growing tendency amongst modern Shi`ah scholars to dismiss the role of `Abdullah ibn Saba (sometimes called ibn Sauda) of San'a, a city of Yemen, in the origin of Shi'ism debate. After the Iranian revolution of 1979, the modern Shi'ah state now wishes to ground its origins on something more concrete, rather than upon the mischief of Jew, in order to gain official recognition as a legitimate Islamic state amongst Muslims.

Is this anonymous author implying the absurdity that the Shi'ahs are so stupid and ignorant that after 1400 years, they have never figured out that their belief and faith are based on fabricated traditions and tales going back to Abdullah Ibn Saba? The Shi'ah, if they were indeed so stupid as to believe a fictitious/hypocrite Jew in their theology, philosophy, jurisprudence, history, and interpretations of the Quran, then how have they survived to this day and age?

It is more interesting when we see the Imams of the majority of the Sunnis were the students of the Imams of Sh'iha (Imam Muhammad Baqir and Imam Ja'far Sadiq, peace be upon them), then one would say the Sunni schools got the basics of their Fiqh from Sh'iha, which means the Sunnis along with the Shi'ahs were the followers of the very same person, the mysterious Abdullah Ibn Saba! Who is left then? Perhaps, the followers of Muhammad Ibn Abdil Wahhab!

jamiat.org.za states:
Upto the classical age of Shi'ism, all of the erudite Shi'ite scholars attributed the origin of Shi'ism to this same ibn Saba. `Allamah Majlisi said: "Some scholars have asserted that ibn Saba was a Jew who accepted Islam and started voicing his opinion of the `wilayat' (divine appointment) of `Ali. While a Jew, he propounded the exaggerative notion that Yusha ibn Nun was divinely appointed to succeed Prophet Musa, he thus adopted a similar stance with regard to `Ali in relation to the Holy Prophet. He was the first to subscribe to the belief of Imamate, and he openly vitriolated his enemies (i.e. the first three Caliphs) and branded them as infidels. The origin of Shi'ism is thus based on Judaism." (Bihar al-Anwar, vol. 25, p. 287). Other Shi`ah scholars who have affirmed this was `Allamah Kashi in his Rijal al-Kashi and `Allamah Mamaqani in his Tanqih al-Maqal.

Although the above statement is not quite what it reads never the less, all that it goes to show is that Allamah Majlisi was asserting what some scholars had said. **("Some scholars have asserted that ibn Saba was a Jew..")** I should point out however that there are less than 14 reports available in the collections of Shi'ah and Sunni, which mentions the name of Abdullah Ibn Saba, and are supplied with the chain of authorities, but in their chain of authorities, the name of Sayf does not exist.

Al-Kushshi (or al-Keshshi; also abbreviated as Kash) (d. 369) who wrote his book "Rijal" in 340 AH mentioned few traditions in which there exists the name of Abdullah Ibn Saba, from the Imams of Ahlul-Bayt. These traditions give a very different picture than those mentioned by Sayf. However, it has been proven for Shi'ah scholars that the book of al- Kushshi (Kash) has many errors, especially in the names and few errors in quotations. He has reported many weak traditions in his book of al-Rijal, and as a result, his book is not considered a reliable source for Shi'ah. Furthermore, the reports of al-Kushshi (Kash) are not found in any of the major 4-books of tradition of the Shi'ah. (For a critical evaluation of his errors, please see al-Rijal by al-Tusteri as well as al-Askari.)

Other Shi'ah scholars, who mentioned Abdullah Ibn Saba, have quoted al-Kushshi or the two historians (i.e., al-A'sh'ari al-Qummi and al-Nawbakhti who did not provide any chain of transmitters or any source for their report). Among those who quoted al-Kushshi (Kash) are: Shaikh al-Tusi(d. 460), Ahmad Ibn Tawoos (d. 673), Allama al-Hilli (d. 726), etc.

jamiat.org.za states:
Amongst Sunni scholars, `Allamah ibn Taimiyyah had confirmed this in his Minhaj al-Sunnah. He wrote: "More than one Shi`ah scholar have affirmed that that the first one to start disparaging the Sahabah and who introduced the doctrine of wilayah was a hypocrite and a zindiq who intended to corrode Islam from within. He wished to scheme as Baulus had schemed against Christianity. Prophet Jesus was raised to the heavens, and there were a precious few who followed his teachings. His teachings thus weakened the fabric of Christianity and many started adopting his exaggerated notions and many kings were won over to their side. When their scholars tried to oppose them, they were killed, some were exiled, while some were confined to life-long sentences in remote monasteries. On the other hand, this ummah will always have a group of staunch followers who will uphold the truth. No corrupt person will be able to destroy Islam, he will only gain some followers." (Minhaj al-Sunnah, vol. 3, p. 261). `Allamah Shahristani has confirmed this too, saying that when `Ali heard the claim of his divinity directly from the mouth of ibn Saba, he exiled him to Mada'in (Al-Milal wa al-Nihal, vol. 2, p. 11).

Among the Sunnis who mentioned the name of Abdullah Ibn Saba in their stories **WITHOUT** bringing any source for their claims, are:

1. Ali Ibn Isma'il al-Ash'ari (d. 330) in his book "Maqalat al-Islamiyin" (Essays about the People of Islam).
2. Abdul-Qahir Ibn Tahir al-Baghdadi (d. 429) in his book "al-Farq Bain al-Firaq" (Differences of the Sects).
3. Muhammad Ibn Abdil-Karim al-Shahrastani (d. 548) in his book "al-Milal wan Nihal" (Nations and Cultures).

The above-mentioned Sunnis do not give any source or any chain of authority for their story about Abdullah Ibn Saba. They have competed with each other to increase the number of sects in Islam with strange names such as al-Kawusiyyah, al-Tayyarah, al Mamturah, al-Ghrabiyyah, al-Ma'lumiyyah !!, al-Majhuliyyah ! In addition, so on **WITHOUT** giving any source or reference for their claims. Living in medieval times, these authors presumed that writing stranger stories and attributing unrealistic events to different Muslim nations will make them more reputable than the other competitors in this area. Moreover, by that, they caused a tragic damage to the history of Islam and committed a great crime for what they have falsely attributed to the Muslim nations.

Some of them have provided silly legends and fairy-tales, whose falsehood are easy to detect nowadays, though it would have been possible for them to succeed in passing off such stories as history in those times. For instance, al-Shahrastani in his book "al-Milal wan Nihal" has mentioned that there was a group of semi-human creatures in the name of "al-Nas-Naas" with only half face, one eye, one hand, and one leg. Muslims could talk to these semi-human creatures and they even exchanged poetry! Some Muslims even used to go hunting these semi-human creatures and they used to eat them! These semi-humans could jump faster than a horse and were ruminant/cud- chewers! Al Shahrastani further mentioned that al-Mutawakkil, the Abbasid Caliph, ordered the scientists of his time to investigate about these creatures! (See al-Milal wan Nihal, by al-Sharastani)

People at that time did not have the modern tools that would enable them to discover the falsehood these unrealistic stories and fairy-tales, and perhaps they would have preferred more extensive and more strange collections which may have seemed a guarantee of their accuracy, even though they were provided with no reference.

In addition, by chronological study of the lifetime of these authors, we can conclude that ALL of them were long after the era of Sayf Ibn Umar, and even after al-Tabari. Therefore, it is quite possible that they all got the story of Abdullah Ibn Saba from Sayf. This claim becomes stronger when one observes that none of them mentioned the source of their reports, which might be because Sayf Ibn Umar's scandal was known to every body by that time and they did not want to discredit their books by mentioning its source. Moreover there exists NO document available related to Abdullah IbnSaba **BEFORE** Sayf. The scholars or historians who lived before Sayf Ibn Umar **NEVER** mentioned the name of Abdullah Ibn Saba in their books. This shows that if Ibn Saba ever existed he was not anything important for the historians before Sayf. This is also another reason to believe that what was propagated around the personality of Abdullah Ibn Saba was initiated by the mass propaganda of Sayf Ibn Umar al-Tamimi.

The reports from Sunni scholars, historians, and storytellers of ancient cultures who wrote few lines about

Abdullah Ibn Saba but did not supply any evidence for their claims, nor did they provide any chain of supportive authorities (isnad) for their reports to be examined, thus they have been dismissed, here is why:

For instance, their reports start with: "some people say so and so..." or "some scholars say so and so..." without mentioning who that scholar was, and where they got it from. It was based on rumors which was propagated by Umayads (AFTER Sayf's work) which had reached them, and some based on the authors' own creativity. This is inferred when we see these authors have reported some legends which are clearly false and rejected by logic. These reports are provided by those who wrote books about "al-Milal wa Nihal" (stories about civilizations and cultures) or "al-Firaq" (divisions/sects).

jamiat.org.za states:
Hafiz ibn Hajar threw more light on the dialogue between `Ali and ibn Saba on this occasion: "Abul Ijlas says that I heard `Ali telling `Abdullah ibn Saba: "By Allah, I have not hidden any secret from anyone which the Holy Prophet told me. I heard the Holy Prophet saying that there would appear thirty liars before the last day, and you are one of them." Once Suwaid ibn Ghafalah visited `Ali during his reign and told him that he had passed a few people amongst whom was ibn Saba speaking ill of Abu Bakr. They claimed that you also held the same opinion." `Ali retorted: "I have nothing to do with this black filthy creature. I seek refuge from Allah that I hold any opinion other than the best for Abu Bakr and `Umar." He then exiled ibn Saba saying that he could not tolerate to live with him in one city. `Ali then ascended the pulpit, and after relating the story said: "I will lash anyone who prefers me over Abu Bakr and `Umar, the lashing of a slanderer." (Lisan al-Mizan, vol. 3, p. 290).

This Sunni tradition is not rated authentic either. The total of these unauthentic tradition by both Shi'ah and Sunni (reported by other than Sayf), do not exceed fourteen at most. They will be even less if you remove repetitions. These few Sunnite and Shi'ite traditions convey that:

1. Abdullah Ibn Saba appeared during the Caliphate of Imam Ali (AS), and not during the rule of Uthman as Sayf alleged.
2. Abdullah Ibn Saba did not say that Ali is the successor of Prophet (PBUH&HF) as Sayf claimed. Rather he said Ali (AS) is God.
3. Imam Ali (AS) burnt him along with all other extremists (al-Ghulat). This is while Sayf does not state such a thing.
4. There is no mention of his existence or his playing a role at the time of Uthman. There is no mention of his agitation against Uthman, which ended up with assassination of Uthman as Sayf attributed to Abdullah Ibn Saba.
5. There is no mention of the role of Abdullah Ibn Saba in the battle of Camel as Sayf attributed to him.
6. These traditions do not indicate that any righteous companions of Prophet followed Abdullah Ibn Saba. This is while Sayf maliciously alleged that some of the most faithful pioneers of Islam such as Abu Darr (RA) and Ammar Yasir (RA) were the students of Abdullah Ibn Saba during the reign of Uthman.

Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani provides the very similar information of what al-Kushshi (Kash) provided. Ibn Hajar mentioned:

"Abdullah Ibn Saba was one of the extremist (al-Ghulat), dualist/seducee/manichaeist (Zindeeq), and misguided, which is conveyed that Ali burnt him with fire." (Lisan al-Mizan, by Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani, v3, p289)

Then Ibn Hajar continues:

"Ibn Asakir mentioned in his History that `his origin (Abdullah Ibn Saba) was from Yemen and that he was a Jew who adopted Islam and traveled in the cities of Muslims and preached them to disobey their rulers, to induce evil amongst them, then he entered Damascus for that purpose.' Then Ibn Asakir mentioned a LONG STORY from the book of al-Futooh of Sayf Ibn Umar, which does not have correct support/authorities (isnad)." (Lisan al-Mizan, by Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani, v3, p289)

Then Ibn Hajar gives a tradition among whose chain of authorities two individuals are missing. In footnote he says that its has been dropped.This is the tradition:

"Ali ascended the pulpit and said: What is wrong with him? people said: He is denying (or lying upon) Allah and His Messenger." (Lisan al-Mizan, by Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani, v3, p289)

In another tradition, Ibn Hajar reported:

"Ali said to Abdullah Ibn Saba: I have been told that there shall be thirty liars/imposters (who claim

prophethood) and your are one of them" (Lisan al-Mizan, by Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani, v3, p290)

He also wrote:

"Ibn Saba and his followers believed in the deity of Ali Ibn Abi Talib, and certainly Ali burnt them by fire during his rule." (Lisan al-Mizan, by Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani, v3, p290)

Beliefs of Ibn Saba in a nutshell

It's fair to ask, according to whom, the enemies of Islam, or it stepchild the Wahhabis?

jamiat.org.za states:
`Ali was divinely appointed to be the Holy Prophet's successor, and that `Ali had his this knowledge from the people.

It's no surprise that the vested interests of the enemies of Islam should attribute Hazrat Ali's forthright successorship of caliphate to a fictitious character, however this wishful thinking is short lived In the light of the following evidence:

Imam Ali reported that the Messenger of God is the one who granted him the office of executorship, brotherhood, and successorship. Sayf Ibn Umar reported that the idea of the executorship of Ali had come from a Jew called Abdullah Ibn Saba. We should ask the members of the Wahhabi syndicate (who call everyone who disagree with them unbeliever) the following question: Do you believe in Imam Ali's report or Sayf Ibn Umar's? Sayf was accused by prominent Sunni scholars of weakness, forgery, and heresy.

Of course, we should not expect any true Muslim to choose the report of a liar such as Sayf Ibn Umar and to reject the report of the Imam Ali Ibn Abi Talib, the Leader of the Faithful, the "brother" of the Prophet (PBUH&HF). The Messenger of God used to say to Ali:

"Your position to me is like the position of Aaron to Moses, except that there shall be no Prophet after me"

Sunni References:

1. Sahih al-Bukhari, Arabic-English version, Traditions 5.56 and 5.700
2. Sahih Muslim, Arabic, v4, pp 1870-71
3. Sunan Ibn Majah, p12
4. Musnad Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, v1, p174
5. al-Khas'is, by al-Nisa'i, pp 15-16
6. Mushkil al-Athar, by al-Tahawi, v2, p309

The Prophet (PBUH&HF) thereby meant that as Moses had left behind Aaron to look after his people as his Caliph when he went to receive the Commandments, in the same way he was leaving Ali behind as his deputy to
look after the affairs of Islam after him. Allah said in Quran:

"... And Moses said unto his brother Aaron: Take my place among my community." (Quran 7:142).

Notice that "Ukhlufni" and "Khalifa" (Caliph) are exactly from the same root.

Do the mercenary writers who endeavor to spread hostility among Muslims forget that while returning from his farewell pilgrimage, and in the presence of over a hundred thousand pilgrims in Ghadir Khum, the Messenger of God declared:

"Do I not have more right over the believers than what they have over themselves?" People cried and answered: "Yes, O' Messenger of God." Then Prophet (PBUH) held up the hand of Ali and said: "Whoever I am his leader, Ali is his leader. O' God, love those who love him, and be hostile to those who are hostile to him."

Some of Sunni References:

1. Sahih Tirmidhi, v2, p298, v5, p63
2. Sunan Ibn Maja, v1, pp 12,43
3. Musnad Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, v1, pp 84,118,119,152,330, v4, pp 281,368,370, 372,378, v5, pp 35,347,358,361,366,419 (from 40 chains of narrators!!!)
4. Fada'il al-Sahaba, by Ahmad Hanbal, v2, pp 563,572
5. al-Mustadrak, by al-Hakim, v2, p129, v3, pp 109-110,116,371
6. Khasa'is, by al-Nisa'i, pp 4,21
7. Majma' al-Zawa'id, by al-Haythami, v9, p103 (from several transmitters)
8. Tafsir al-Kabir, by Fakhr al-Razi, v12, pp 49-50
9. al-Durr al-Manthur, by al-Hafiz Jalaluddin al-Suyuti, v3, p19
10. Tarikh al-Khulafa, by al-Suyuti, pp 169,173
11. al-Bidayah wal-Nihayah, by Ibn Kathir, v3, p213, v5, p208
12. Mushkil al-Athar, by al-Tahawi, v2, pp 307-308
13. Habib al-Siyar, by Mir Khand, v1, part 3, p144
14. Sawaiq al-Muhriqah, by Ibn Hajar al-Haythami, p26
15. al-Isabah, by Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani, v2, p509; v1, part1, p319, v2, part1, p57, v3, part1, p29, v4, part 1, pp 14,16,143
16. Tabarani, who narrated from companions such as Ibn Umar, Malik Ibn al-Hawirath, Habashi Ibn Junadah, Jari, Sa'd Ibn Abi Waqqas, Anas Ibn Malik, Ibn Abbas, Amarah,Buraydah,...
17. Tarikh, by al-Khatib Baghdadi, v8, p290
18. Hilyatul Awliya', by Abu Nu'aym, v4, p23, v5, pp26-27
19. al-Istiab, by Ibn Abd al-Barr, Chapter of word "ayn" (Ali), v2, p462
20. Kanzul Ummal, by al-Muttaqi al-Hindi, v6, pp 154,397
21. al-Mirqat, v5, p568
22. al-Riyad al-Nadirah, by al-Muhib al-Tabari, v2, p172
23. Dhaka'ir al-Uqba, by al-Muhib al-Tabari, p68
24. Fayd al-Qadir, by al-Manawi, v6, p217
25. Usdul Ghabah, by Ibn Athir, v4, p114
26. Yanabi' al-Mawaddah, by al-Qudoozi al-Hanafi, p297
27. ... And hundreds more...

No Muslim would ever doubt that the Messenger of God is the leader of all Muslims for all generations. The Prophet in his statement granted Ali the same position as his, when he said that Ali is the leader of everyone who follows the Prophet.

This declaration which was narrated by more than one hundred and ten companions and rated authentic (Sahih) and frequent (Mutawatir) by the leading Sunni scholars, not only indicates that Ali is the executor of Messenger, but also indicates that Ali takes the place of the leadership of all Muslims after the Messenger of Allah. However, these mercenaries still allow themselves to say that the belief that Ali was the executor of the
Messenger had come from a Jew who declared his Islam during the days of Uthman!!!

---

jamiat.org.za states:
He later called for the divinity of `Ali. Having said so, he proclaimed himself as `Ali's Prophet. Even Shi`ah scholars have gawked at his audacity. He initially did not openly preach these beliefs, but he later abandoned his secret and started a vigorous campaign. (Bihar al-Anwar, vol. 25, p. 286)

This anonymous, presumed Wahhabi author is desperately trying to intertwine the unauthentic following conjecture of the Sunni tradition and link it with the shi'ah; nice try.

"Ibn Saba and his followers believed in the deity of Ali Ibn Abi Talib, and certainly Ali burnt them by fire during his rule." (Lisan al-Mizan, by Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani, v3, p290)

---

jamiat.org.za states:
He preferred `Ali over Caliph Abu Bakr, `Umar and `Uthman, saying that they usurped the Caliphate form `Ali. He declared open enmity towards all those who did not subscribe to such a belief and branded them as kuffar.

Abdullah Ibn Saba has no base on the disputes immediately after the death of prophet related to his successorship, and all relevant claims of Shi'ah is proven to be on the death of the prophet or even before that, not during the reign of Uthman which is far long after prophet's demise. At the very start and immediately after the death of the prophet (PBUH&HF), the Shi'ah of Ali included those companions who where loyal to Imam Ali, such as Ammar Ibn Yasir, Abu-Dhar al-Ghafari, Miqdad, Salman al-Farsi, Ibn

Abbas ...etc., all gathered in the house of Fatimah (AS). Even Talha and Zubair were loyal to Imam Ali at the beginning and joint the others in the house of Fatimah. al-Bukhari narrated:

Umar said: "And no doubt after the death of the Prophet we were informed that the Ansar disagreed with us and gathered in the shed of Bani Sa'da. 'Ali and Zubair and whoever was with them, opposed us, while the emigrants gathered with Abu Bakr."
Sunni Reference: Sahih al-Bukhari, Arabic-English, v8, Tradition #817

His devious scheme

---

jamiat.org.za states:
Speaking of the devious scheme which ibn Saba gradually implemented to achieve his aims, Shah `Abd al-`Aziz has written: "Ibn Saba first called the masses to show their love and devotion to the ahl al-Bait (Prophetic Household). He then started claiming that none could excel the ahl al-Bait in status. When he gained some popularity at this, he boldly claimed that `Ali was the most superior person after the Holy Prophet. When he saw that some of his followers had indeed believed him, he confided in them that `Ali was in reality the appointed successor of the Holy Prophet, but the Sahabah had usurped this right from him. He then unleashed a campaign of vilification against all the Sahabah, and the first three Caliphs in particular amongst the army of `Ali. What amazed ibn Saba was that people still believed him! He thus took the opportunity the corrupt the belief pattern of the Muslims. He thus told his staunch supporters that `Ali had powers above those of a normal human being, he was Allah, besides whom there was no other power. This `secret' until it reached the ears of `Ali himself. `Ali threatened to burn all of them, asked them to repent and exiled them to Mada'in. As a result of this propaganda, the army of `Ali was split into four factions: First, The initial and sincere Shi`ahs who are in fact Sunnis. They followed the directives of `Ali, and paid due respect to all the Sahabah, including those who opposed `Ali like Sayyidah `A'ishah and Mu`awiyah. `Ali singled out this group for praising on many occasions, and they did not fall prey to the propaganda machine of ibn Saba. Second, The Preferential (Tafdili) Shi`ahs. They preferred `Ali over the rest of the Sahabah. Third, the Saba'i Shi`ahs or the Tabariyah. They went a step further and regarded all the Sahabah as hypocrites, usurpers, and kuffar. Fourth, the Exaggerationaists (Ghali) Shi`ahs who proclaimed `Ali as Lord. These were the special students of ibn Saba. Thus, the origin of Shi'ism was planted by ibn Saba and since then it continued to spread." (Tuhfah Ithna `Ashariyyah, pp. 3-5) All these accounts prove that ibn Saba was not a product of the figment of anyone's imagination, he was rather a well-known personality who whose notoriety matched that of the devil too.

The above conjecture made by the pseudo-scholar Shah Abd al-Aziz is his problem, and it only goes to show his ignorance. He should be concerned that he can't back up his little fairytale **from any** Sahih books of tradition. By the way, does Shah Abd al-Aziz believe in the semi-human creatures in the name of "al-Nas-Naas" with only half face, one eye, one hand, and one leg, and such other fairytales too?

One of the funniest conjectures made above is *Quote: "First, The initial and sincere Shi`ahs who are in fact Sunnis. They followed the directives of `Ali, and paid due respect to all the Sahabah, including those who opposed `Ali like Sayyidah `A'ishah and Mu`awiyah".* If in fact, those Sunnis were Shi'ah, then who or what should we name the people that gave allegiance to Mu'awiyah and cursed Ali (a.s.)?

The pseudo-scholars have ignored what is well-known in the history of Islam and which was reported by a host of good reporters. The revolution against 'Uthman was a result of the efforts of prominent personalities in Medina, such as 'A'ishah, Talhah, Zubayr, Abdul Rahman Ibn Awf, and Amr Ibn Al-As. Instead of attributing the revolution to real people who rebelled against 'Uthman and brought about the revolution, the dividers of the Muslims refuse to accept the truth or mention it. They attribute the revolution to an imaginary Jew, relying on the report of Sayf Ibn 'Umar Al-Tamimi, a man who was accused by prominent Sunni scholars to be a man of lies and deviations. They chose to accept Sayf's report in order to cover up for the Caliph, 'A'ishah, Talhah, and Zubayr.

It is even more amazing that 'A'ishah, Talhah, Zubayr, and Mu'awiyah Ibn Abi Sufyan fought the Imam in two wars, unprecedented in the history of Islam. They were the most zealous to smear the reputation of Imam Ali and his followers. Yet the opponents of Imam Ali did not accuse his supporters of being students of Ibn Saba.

History clearly states that Mu'awiyah commanded all the Imams of the mosques throughout the Muslim World to curse Imam Ali at every Friday prayer. If the imaginary Ibn Saba had any small role in the revolution against 'Uthman, Mu'awiyah would have made it the main topic of his defamation campaign against the Imam and his supporters. He would have publicized throughout the Muslim World that those who killed 'Uthman were students of Ibn Saba and that they were the ones who brought Ali to power. However, neither Mu'awiyah nor 'A'ishah took this route because Ibn Saba's story was invented by Sayf Ibn 'Umar Al-Tamimi who lived in the second Hijra century after their death.

jamiat.org.za states:
The fact that he is not well known amongst the Traditionists (Muhaddithun) is not prove enough that he was a created and legendary figure. His absence in the books of Rijal (Biographies) is because he did not report any traditions (ahadith), and not because he did not exist.

Nay, the fact that he is **not known at all** among authentic tradition reporters is because he does not exist, never has, never will, although, such anonymous writers, such as yourself, and the rest of your pathetic cohorts may object!

Dr. Taha Husain, who has analyzed these stories has rejected them. He wrote in "al-Fitnah al-Kubra" that:

In my opinion, those who have tried to emphasize on the story of Abdullah Ibn Saba, have committed a crime in the history and hurt themselves too. The first thing that is observed is that in the important collections the name of Ibn Saba does not appear when they discuss the agitation against Uthman. Ibn Sa'd does not mention the name of Abdullah Ibn Saba when he discusses the Caliphate of Uthman and the revolt against him. Also the book by al-Baladhuri, "Ansab al-Ashraf", which I think the most important and the most detailed book about the revolt against Uthman, the name of Abdullah Ibn Saba has never been mentioned. It appears that al-Tabari was the first who reported the story of Ibn Saba from Sayf, and then other historians quoted al-Tabari in this regard.

In his other book "Ali wa Banuh", he also mentioned:

The story of Ibn Saba is nothing but myth, and is the invention of some historians, since it contradicts other historical documents. ...The fact is that the friction between Shi'ah and Sunni have had many shapes, and each group was advocating itself and denouncing the other by any means possible. This requires a historian to be much more cautious when analyzing the controversial reports related to seditions and revolts.

---

jamiat.org.za states:
In the face of the above evidence, the call of modern Shi`ahs to disclaim their roots has a sinister ring to it. They wish to discredit the claims of sound historiography in doing so, and came up with new explanations which might have some early political legitimism, but has no scientific basis and is not supported by corroborative texts. At most it can be said that though Shi'ism is not entirely based on the teachings of ibn Saba, it has borrowed many Saba'i characteristics which plays an integral in modern Twelver (Ithna `Ashari) Shi'ism.
Al-Rasheed Volume3 No.10

Muhammad Jawad Chirri is Lebanese by birth and a graduate of the Islamic Institute of Najaf in Iraq. Before reaching the age of 25, he wrote about Islamic jurisprudence and its basis. The following statement of his really sums it up.

In conclusion, such false and malicious campaign started after the birth of the Islamic Republic in Iran. It seems that some of the Arab governments found the birth of this Republic a threatening danger. This Republic reminds Muslims of the period of the righteous caliphate and makes a clear distinction between the words and the deeds of the Arab governments, who claim to be committed to Islam, yet spend the public wealth to satisfy the low desires of the rulers.

These governments tried to extinguish the light of the Islamic Republic by war, but they did not succeed. Therefore, they are trying to deceive the Muslim population and turn them against the Iranian Muslims by fabricating accusations in a sectarian campaign, aiming to convince the innocent Muslims that the Shi'ites have deviated from the path of Islam. Should such a campaign succeed, unsuspecting and unsophisticated Muslims may find it religiously legal to combat the Shi'ites and shed the blood of the Iranians, who have sacrificed for Islam more than any other people have.
The Shi'ites have tried for many years to meet this campaign with silence, closing their eyes and hoping that it would end, and that there would be no need to refute the malicious accusations.

It was also hoped that some of the Sunni scholars would try to refute these accusations. There is no doubt that many Sunni scholars are aware of the Islamic doctrines to which the Shi'ites subscribe. Should they be unaware of the Shi'ite doctrines, it would be very easy to become acquainted with them. There are numerous books written by Shi'ite scholars about those doctrines, and those books are available.

It is possible for the Sunni scholars to call for an Islamic conference in which religious differences may be discussed and an appreciation for each other's viewpoint developed. This is what the Qur'an calls for:

"O you who believe, if a transgressor brings to you news, verify it, lest you inflict damage on people

unwittingly; you may consequently regret your hasty action." (ch. 49, v.6)

It is regrettable that the Sunni scholars did not move in this direction and did not try, as far as is known, to refute the untrue accusations, which were publicized by the hypocrite campaigners.

Our silence did not stop this campaign. It made it more vehement. Many people thought that our silence is evidence of the truthfulness of the accusations, and that we are unable to answer them.

Thus, it has become necessary to clarify the truth and inform all the Muslims who like to know the truth. In this effort, we shall not accuse the Sunni brothers of disbelief, deviation, or transgression, as some of them have accused the Shi'ites. We shall not place ourselves in such a position, which is improper for any Muslim to take. We obey the Almighty in His prohibition:

"O you who believe, let not a folk ridicule another folk who may be better than they are; nor should women ridicule other women who may be better than them. Neither defame one another nor insult one another by calling names. That is the name of lewdness after faith and whoso turns not in repentance, such are evildoers." (ch. 49, v.11)

It should be pointed out to the reader that those who make these prohibited accusations use a very strange method to indict millions of Muslims whom they do not know, did not see, and with whom they did not speak. They tried and convicted millions of Muslims who lived centuries ago, along with the numerous future Shi'ite generations yet to be born. They have also convicted millions of contemporary Muslims without questioning them and without searching for the truth, which is within easy access to any interested person.

Sunni Propaganda

'ABDULLAH IBN SABA - FOUNDER OF SHI'ISM

There have been a growing tendency amongst modern Shi`ah scholars to dismiss the role of `Abdullah ibn Saba (sometimes called ibn Sauda) of San'a, a city of Yemen, in the origin of Shi'ism debate. After the Iranian revolution of 1979, the modern Shi'ah state now wishes to ground its origins on something more concrete, rather than upon the mischief of Jew, in order to gain official recognition as a legitimate Islamic state amongst Muslims.

Upto the classical age of Shi'ism, all of the erudite Shi'ite scholars attributed the origin of Shi'ism to this same ibn Saba. `Allamah Majlisi said: *"Some scholars have asserted that ibn Saba was a Jew who accepted Islam and started voicing his opinion of the `wilayat' (divine appointment) of `Ali. While a Jew, he propounded the exaggerative notion that Yusha ibn Nun was divinely appointed to succeed Prophet Musa, he thus adopted a similar stance with regard to `Ali in relation to the Holy Prophet. He was the first to subscribe to the belief of Imamate, and he openly vitriolated his enemies (i.e. the first three Caliphs) and branded them as infidels. The origin of Shi'ism is thus based on Judaism."* (Bihar al-Anwar, vol. 25, p. 287). Other Shi`ah scholars who have affirmed this was `Allamah Kashi in his Rijal al-Kashi and `Allamah Mamaqani in his Tanqih al-Maqal.

Amongst Sunni scholars, `Allamah ibn Taimiyyah had confirmed this in his Minhaj al-Sunnah. He wrote: *"More than one Shi`ah scholar have affirmed that that the first one to start disparaging the Sahabah and who introduced the doctrine of wilayah was a hypocrite and a zindiq who intended to corrode Islam from within. He wished to scheme as Baulus had schemed against Christianity. Prophet Jesus was raised to the heavens, and there were a precious few who followed his teachings. His teachings thus weakened the fabric of Christianity and many started adopting his exaggerated notions and many kings were won over to their side. When their scholars tried to oppose them, they were killed, some were exiled, while some were confined to life-long sentences in remote monasteries. On the other hand, this ummah will always have a group of staunch followers who will uphold the truth. No corrupt person will be able to destroy Islam, he will only gain some followers."* (Minhaj al-Sunnah, vol. 3, p. 261). `Allamah Shahristani has confirmed this too, saying that when `Ali heard the claim of his divinity directly from the mouth of ibn Saba, he exiled him to Mada'in (Al-Milal wa al-Nihal, vol. 2, p. 11).

Hafiz ibn Hajar threw more light on the dialogue between `Ali and ibn Saba on this occasion: *"Abul Ijlas says that I heard `Ali telling `Abdullah ibn Saba: "By Allah, I have not hidden any secret from anyone which the Holy Prophet told me. I heard the Holy Prophet saying that there would appear thirty liars before the last day, and you are one of them." Once Suwaid ibn Ghafalah visited `Ali during his reign and told him that he had passed a few people amongst whom was ibn Saba speaking ill of Abu Bakr. They claimed that you also held the same opinion." `Ali retorted: "I have nothing to do with this black filthy creature. I seek refuge from Allah that I hold any opinion other than the best for Abu Bakr and `Umar." He then exiled ibn Saba saying that he could not tolerate to live with him in one city. `Ali then ascended the pulpit, and after relating the story said: "I will lash anyone who prefers me over Abu Bakr and `Umar, the lashing of a slanderer."* (Lisan al-Mizan, vol. 3, p. 290).

Beliefs of Ibn Saba in a nutshell

`Ali was divinely appointed to be the Holy Prophet's successor, and that `Ali had hid this knowledge from the people.
He later called for the divinity of `Ali. Having said so, he proclaimed himself as `Ali's Prophet. Even Shi`ah scholars have gawked at his audacity. He initially did not openly preach these beliefs, but he later abandoned his secret and started a vigorous campaign. (Bihar al-Anwar, vol. 25, p. 286)
He preferred `Ali over Caliph Abu Bakr, `Umar and `Uthman, saying that they usurped the Caliphate form `Ali. He declared open enmity towards all those who did not subscribe to such a belief and branded them as kuffar.

His devious scheme

Speaking of the devious scheme which ibn Saba gradually implemented to achieve his aims, Shah `Abd al-`Aziz has written: "Ibn Saba first called the masses to show their love and devotion to the ahl al-Bait (Prophetic Household). He then started claiming that none could excel the ahl al-Bait in status. When he gained some popularity at this, he boldly claimed that `Ali was the most superior person after the Holy Prophet. When he saw that some of his followers had indeed believed him, he confided in them that `Ali was in reality the appointed successor of the Holy Prophet, but the Sahabah had usurped this right from him. He then unleashed a campaign of vilification against all the Sahabah, and the first three Caliphs in particular amongst the army of `Ali. What amazed ibn Saba was that people still believed him! He thus took the opportunity the corrupt the belief pattern of the Muslims. He thus told his staunch supporters that `Ali had powers above those of a normal human being, he was Allah, besides whom there was no other power. This `secret' until it reached the ears of `Ali himself. `Ali threatened to burn all of them, asked them to repent and exiled them to Mada'in. As a result of this propaganda, the army of `Ali was split into four factions: First, The initial and sincere Shi`ahs who are in fact Sunnis. They followed the directives of `Ali, and paid due respect to all the Sahabah, including those who opposed `Ali like Sayyidah `A'ishah and Mu`awiyah. `Ali singled out this group for praising on many occasions, and they did not fall prey to the propaganda machine of ibn Saba. Second, The Preferential (Tafdili) Shi`ahs. They preferred `Ali over the rest of the Sahabah. Third, the Saba'i Shi`ahs or the Tabariyah. They went a step further and regarded all the Sahabah as hypocrites, usurpers, and kuffar. Fourth, the Exaggerationaists (Ghali) Shi`ahs who proclaimed `Ali as Lord. These were the special students of ibn Saba. Thus, the origin of Shi'ism was planted by ibn Saba and since then it continued to spread." (Tuhfah Ithna `Ashariyyah, pp. 3-5) All these accounts prove that ibn Saba was not a product of the figment of anyone's imagination, he was rather a well-known personality who whose notoriety matched that of the devil too.
The fact that he is not well known amongst the Traditionists (Muhaddithun) is not prove enough that he was a created and legendary figure. His absence in the books of Rijal (Biographies) is because he did not report any traditions (ahadith), and not because he did not exist.
In the face of the above evidence, the call of modern Shi`ahs to disclaim their roots has a sinister ring to it. They wish to discredit the claims of sound historiography in doing so, and came up with new explanations which might have some early political legitimism, but has no scientific basis and is not supported by corroborative texts. At most it can be said that though Shi'ism is not entirely based on the teachings of ibn Saba, it has borrowed many Saba'i characteristics which plays an integral in modern Twelver (Ithna `Ashari) Shi'ism.

Al-Rasheed Volume3 No.10